

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-7 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U. S. Patent Number 6,640,242 issued to O'Neal on October 28, 2003.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, applicants' claim 1 recites,

"An apparatus, comprising:

one or more node components that, upon registration of one or more users in a second network subsequent to registration of one or more of the one or more users in a first network, serve to cause one or more mailbox profile portions, for one or more voice mailboxes that are associated with the one or more of the one or more users, to be copied from one or more first voicemail system components that are associated with the first network to one or more second voicemail system components that are associated with the second network, contemporaneous with a location of one or more voicemail messages, for the one or more of the one or more users, on one or more storage devices that are coupled with the one or more second voicemail system components through an internet protocol network;

wherein the one or more mailbox profile portions comprise one or more addresses for one or more locations on the one or more storage devices that serve to allow the one or more of the one or more users to employ the one or more voice mailboxes on the one or more second voicemail system components to access one or more of the one or more voicemail messages on the one or more storage devices, and

wherein one of said first network and said second network is a wireless network".

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

In essence, registered users may access voicemail messages on a second voicemail system component associated with a second network that were copied from a first voicemail system component associated with a first network.

O'Neal does not teach applicants' claim 1. Instead, O'Neal discloses a predominantly analog/voice public switched telephone network (PSTN) and a predominantly digital Internet network that are connected to a number of point of presence (POPs) that contain local databases, i.e., first voicemail system component, for storing voice, fax, and e-mail messages. The POPs are connected to a network operations center (NOC) that contains a master database, i.e., second voicemail system component, that replicates data stored in the POP local databases. O'Neal teaches that users on either the PSTN or Internet network are able to retrieve messages stored in the POP local databases. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, O'Neal does not teach that users can access messages stored in the master database. See column 6, lines 52-54. The master database is used for backup and archival purposes. See column 8, lines 12-19. Thus, O'Neal is missing the elements "wherein the one or more mailbox profile portions comprise one or more addresses for one or more locations on the one or more storage devices that serve to allow the one or more of the one or more users to employ the one or more voice mailboxes on the one or more second voicemail system components to access one or more of the one or more voicemail messages on the one or more storage devices", as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Second, applicants agree that O'Neal provides an audio streamer in the POPs that stream playback of stored messages through either the PSTN or Internet network. The audio streamer streams audio to both networks from the local POP database, i.e., first voicemail system component. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, the audio streamers do not stream audio from the master database, i.e., second voicemail system component, that replicates data stored in the POP local databases, i.e., first voicemail system component, as required by applicants' claim 1.

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that O'Neal does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Neal. Since claims 2-13 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over O'Neal.

Independent claims 14 and 16 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by O'Neal. For example, claims 14 and 16, as amended, recite, "wherein the address serves to allow the user to employ the second voice mailbox on the second voicemail system component to access the voicemail message". O'Neal does not teach this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, independent claims 14 and 16 are likewise allowable over O'Neal. Since claim 15 depends from claim 14 and claim 17 depends from claim 16, these dependent claims are also allowable over O'Neal.


LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: March 28, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382